[1st November 1935

## Appendix III.

[Vide answer to question No. 380 asked by Diwan Bahadur C. S. Ratna abhapati Mudaliyar at the meeting of the Legislative Council hel on the 1st November 1935, page 344 supra.]

| Name of the municipality. | Population as per | General Account —Ordinary —1934-35. Revenue from taxation. | Other revenues excluding Government grants. | Name of the Commissioner. | Pay drawn prior to the appointment as Commissioner. | Pay drawn as Commissioner. Pay. | pecia p y. | Conveyance allowance. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | RS. | RS. | | RS. | RS. | RS. | RS. |
| Anantapur .. | 15,099 | 23,606 | 30,461 | M.R.Ry. B. Lakshmana Pillai, B.A., B.L. | 125 | 125 | .. | 15 |
| Chidambaram .. | 25,084 | 48,874 | 30,349 | M.R.Ry. K. Govindarajulu Nayudu, B.A. | 150 | 150 | 37½ | 20 |
| Chingleput .. | 14,358 | 21,002 | 15,671 | Saiyyid Ahmed Sahib Bahadur. | 100 | 125 | .. | 15 |
| Parlakimedi .. | 20,072 | 21,842 | 9,276 | M.R.Ry. Rash Behari Patnaik. | 65 | 125 | .. | 15 |
| Narasaraopet .. | 15,403 | 20,817 | 28,960 | M.R.Ry. I. Raja Rao Nayudu. | 88 | 125 | .. | 15 |
| Nellore .. .. | 45,895 | 89,211 | 48,148 | M.R.Ry. K. Ramachandra Rao. | 175 | 175 | .. | 20 |
| Sivakasi .. | 15,212 | 15,596 | 9,038 | M.R.Ry. K. P. M. Telakat. | 100 | 125 | .. | 15 |
| Vizagapatam .. | 57,303 | 1,41,805 | 49,519 | M.R.Ry. K. Sanyasi Raju, B.A., B.L. | 400 | 400 | .. | 40 |

## Appendix IV.

[Vide answer to question No. 388 asked by Mr. U. C. Subrahmanya Bhatt at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 1st November 1935, page 351 supra.]

Letter from the Collector of South Kanara, dated 1st September 1935, D. Dis. No. 3556/35.

[Assignment—Land (South Kanara)—Mangalore taluk and town—Depressed classes—Legislative Council question—Information reported.]

There is no land which stands reserved for ex-army men in this district as all such land was shown in the Revenue accounts as reserved for assignment to the depressed classes. No land reserved for the depressed classes on the Kadri Hill in Mangalore Town and in its suburbs has been assigned to others.

## Appendix V.

[Vide answer to question No. 393 asked by Mr. K. A. Nachiyappa Gounder at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 1st November 1935, page 356 supra.]

(1)

Letter from the Inspector-General of Police, dated 27th November 1934, R.C. No. 1456-2/Audit/34.

I have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the Salem District Superintendent of Police's report R.C. No. 2235/Genl./34, dated 29th October 1934, together with a copy of the Salem District Magistrate's

1st November 1935]

**Endorsement R.O.C. No. 49/M/34-D-1, dated 15th November 1934, recommending the continuance for another year from 1st January 1935 of the temporary additional police quartered at Attaiyampatti.**

2. I am in full agreement with the views of the District Magistrate, Salem, and recommend that the continuance of the additional police of one Sub-Inspector and seven constables be sanctioned.

* * * *

(2)

Letter from the District Superintendent of Police, Salem, to the Inspector-General of Police, Madras (through the District Magistrate, Salem, and the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Western Range, Coimbatore), dated 29th October 1934, R.C. No. 2235/Genl./34.

[Additional Police—Attaiyampatti village—Continuance of—One Sub-Inspector and seven police constables—One more year from 1st January 1935. *Reference.*—R.O.C. No. 49/M/34, dated 19th October 1934, from the District Magistrate, Salem, and R.C. No. 1456/Audit of 1934, dated 6th October 1934, from the Inspector-General of Police, Madras.]

The additional police force at Attaiyampatti village, Salem district, was established from 1st January 1933 for one year, and its continuance for another year from 1st January 1934 was sanctioned in G.O. Ms. No. 657, Public (Police), dated 13th December 1933.

2. In my last report recommending the continuance of the additional police for one year, I had dealt with the unsatisfactory situation in the village and the absence of any material change. The events in the village for the period from the last report up to this date shows that the situation in the village is such as to justify the continuance of the additional police force for a further period of one year. The leaders of the two factions as well as their adherents have not yet completely realized their responsibilities nor shown any signs of reformation. Several instances of assault and intimidation have been reported by the adherents of both parties during the year showing thereby the continuance of the strained feelings. Cases of stone-throwing in more than half a dozen instances in the course of the last three months as well as cases of petty assaults and intimidation have been reported by both parties. In connexion with a dispute over a pathway among the Adi-Dravidas of the village, the leaders attempted to take sides but were warned off by the local police. There has been an instance of mischief of fire due to the faction and another instance where a villager was intimidated for his refusal to pay Rs. 170 to the leaders in connexion with a divorce affair. In June last a constable was assaulted by one Ponnuswami, an adherent of Chinna Kandan's party, as he had reported a case of nuisance against Ponnuswami. He was prosecuted under section 332, Indian Penal Code, and sentenced to eight months' rigorous imprisonment. The Mariamman festival in the village, in August 1934, was not celebrated on account of the leaders of the two factions failing to come to an agreement. From all these

[1st November 1935

instances, it would be clear that the feelings between the two factionists still continue to be strained and that it would not be advisable to abolish the additional police for the present. There has, no doubt, been a certain amount of improvement in the situation since my last report, in that the leaders are gradually losing their influence in and around the village, but the situation is such as to require the continuance of the additional police for a further period of at least one year.

* * * *

(3)

Endorsement of the District Magistrate of Salem, R.O.C. No. 49/M/34-D-1, dated 15th November 1934.

[Police—Additional—Salem taluk—Attaiyampatti village—Exemption of certain persons from payment of tax.]

I have discussed this matter with the District Superintendent of Police and the Subdivisional Magistrate. I have considered the representations presented to me by certain of the inhabitants requesting the removal of the punitive police on the ground that the fall in the statistics of crimes for the village proved that the punitive police was beyond the financial resources of the village.

2. It is true that there has been a decrease in the number of serious crimes during the past 12 months but this must in part be due to the presence of the punitive police. By itself, it is no indication that the situation has sufficiently improved to remove the necessity for the punitive police and that if they were removed crimes of violence would not be common again. The incident referred to in the District Superintendent's report, particularly the failure to agree on the Mariamman festival this year, suggests that while the influence of the leaders of the faction is dwindling there still remains a strong party feeling in the village. The disquieting symptom about Attaiyampatti is the defiant spirit which is still found among the inhabitants towards the forces of law and order. A police constable has been assaulted in the course of his duty and frivolous complaints have been made about the police. Both the District Superintendent of Police and the Subdivisional Magistrate consider that the spirit of defiance is by no means cowed and that there is a real danger of further outbreaks of violence if the punitive forces are removed.

3. As to the question of financial burden the tax at present rates represents an annual charge of about 1·6 per cent of the capital value of the property of the assessees. This cannot be considered as intolerable burden nor would continuance for another year ruin the villagers. Collections have not been attended with any serious difficulty and so far, I gather, it has not been necessary to bring to actual sale any property in realization of the punitive police-tax. Out of a demand of Rs. 3,700 odd for 1933 only Rs. 40 remains to be collected and of the current demand of Rs. 2,425 up to the end of August only Rupees 425–11–10 is still uncollected.

* * * *